

THE LOUISVILLE WEEKLY JOURNAL.

VOLUME XXXIV.

WEEKLY JOURNAL
WRITTEN AND PUBLISHED BY
PRENTICE, HENDERSON, & OSBORN.

JOURNAL OFFICE BUILDING
Green Street, between Third and Fourth.
Subscription, \$1 per annum—Daily Journal
61c. Extra Weekly \$1. Weekly, single copy, 25c—50c—
copies or more, 62c.

NOTICE TO MAIL SUBSCRIBERS.—
The time will be delayed after the name on each
paper and thus every week subscribers can see what
the term of sales is before it appears. We do not
know of any other paper that has done this.

All advertisements must be paid for in advance
and no one will be admitted to the office of this paper.
Geo. D. Prentice, Editor.
J. L. Chapman, *Advertisement*.

AGENTS.

KENTUCKY.
M. L. Orton, Covington; J. Bascom, Frankfort;
J. C. Taylor, Frankfort; J. D. Smith, Richmond;
W. J. Vaughan, Louisville; W. H. Lambdin, Hopkins-
ville; W. H. K. Brown, Paducah; R. H. Smith, Frank-
fort; A. J. Campbell, Louisville; J. G. Lamont, Paducah;
G. J. Taylor, Cincinnati; Dr. H. G. Lawrence, Lar-
mont; J. J. Bradford, Angier; S. M. Chambers, George-
town; J. H. Chamberlain, Campbell's Bay, Ky.; Tompkins-
ville; Gen. J. T. Lewis, Covington; Dr. E. V. Lewis, Louisville.
The above agents are authorized to receive
for money sent for subscription to our paper.

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1864.

The Union Democracy of Kentucky will meet in State convention at Littleton about three weeks from to-day. The counties that have not yet taken steps for the appointment of delegates to the convention should by all means take such steps without further delay. No time ought to be lost. A large number of the counties have already appointed delegates, and the greater number of the rest will certainly make the appointment in due season, but we would fain have every solitary county represent itself at the convention in the body. When it is done, it may carry new hope to the heart in the remote nooks and corners of the Commonwealth. Nothing else in the ordinary course of political action avails and unavoids a people with equal power. Let the Union men in the counties that have not yet acted in this matter see to it that reasonable action is taken. A large convention of the first and truest patriots of Kentucky is demanded by the highest interests alike of the Commonwealth and of the Union. And we rejoice to say that the convention will be to one of the very largest and most distinguished ever held in the State. We hope that at the close of the present week there will be few counties which have not either appointed delegates or taken the step preliminary to the appointment. The issue in Kentucky is now very distinctly made up between the two parties, the abolitionists and the pro-slavery party. The former postponed the abolition convention from the 15th of May to the twenty-fifth, in deference to the opinions of various abolitionists as expressed in the columns of the Frankfort Commonwealth and other organs of the party. There will be accordingly but a single abolition convention, which will be held at the same time and place with the Union Convention. This should be as it must prove an additional incentive to the Union men of Kentucky to come up in full force and from all quarters in order to assert the principles and vindicate the honor of the Commonwealth. We know this incentive cannot be powerless. It must lead fresh determination in the breast of every true Kentuckian. To your work, then, true Kentuckians, until it is completed. Until then, no neutrals or fakers, Let us Union Convention on the twenty-fifth to work for you and for the occasion. Let it exceed the Union convention in size and in character as far as the Union party of the State exceeds in these particular the application of original abolitionists and renegades and Unionists and impudent renegades that constitutes the abolition party here. And it will, if you but do your duty as becomes true Kentuckians.

Watch it now!—It is sometimes a little hard to tell whether a disruptor runs off from the question in dispute, and who takes to bluster instead of argument, does so on account of a real inability to comprehend the question or on account of a desire to hide himself in his own ink;—whether, in other words, he is playing the fool or the cut-throat.

For example, Mr. Lincoln's new organ in this city, in a very coarse and disreputable article in the number of Saturday, under-takes to address to the Louisville Journal an argumentum ad hominem in defense or palliation of Mr. Lincoln's doctrine that his will and not the constitution is the supreme law of the land, setting forth, with impudent particularity and a vast deal of truth and fury, that we have advanced measures which some people do not think in all respects as we do have thought unconstitutional, that we have advanced unconstitutional measures which some other people have so defended, that we were opposed to the policy of coercion at the outbreak of the rebellion, that we favored the Crittenden Compromise, and, finally, that we waited in recommending the formation of a new confederacy in the event of a dissolution of the Union! as if any one of those positions or all of them together afforded the slightest countenance to the doctrine in dispute. Mr. Lincoln's doctrine is that whatever becomes indispensable becomes thereby lawful, though expressly forbidden by the constitution—that, in short, his discretion overrides the constitution, and is the supreme law of the land. The question is not as to whether this or that measure is constitutional or not, but as whether obedience to the constitution is obligatory to the President or not. Mr. Lincoln says it is not. He avows that the President's discretion is above the constitution. In equivalent terms, he avows that he is lawfully the dictator of the American people. This is the doctrine; and, whenever Mr. Lincoln's organ can bring forward anything in its defense, the Louisville Journal "join in the chorus of peace" on any terms, boys! peace on any terms!" The fellow knows that we have joined in no such "chorus." He knows that, in saying that we have, he is a slanderer, a calumniator, a scoundrel, a caitiff, a scoundrel, and as foul as the devilishness of his doctrine.

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized." But didn't the commander of Fort Pillow recognize the nigger? Didn't General Seymour, in Florida, recognize the nigger? Didn't General Banks, in Louisiana, recognize the nigger? If the nigger wasn't recognized upon those occasions, how was he and where on earth the element of the light? What next?

Exchange. We wager Barnum will have a bottle of it on exhibition in his museum after the first thunder shower. The analysis above, however, is not correct, for we have always discovered a percentage of iron in the fish which proceeds from contact with the bolts, a very pretty synthetic experiment may be tried during the winter weather by mixing water with fish oil, which evolves hydrogen, and, combining with the oxygen of the air, the compound fuses and effervesces in soda water. We think it would be just as easy to effect our synthesis as the analysis of which we have been speaking.

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in us. Shame on him. Did we ever seek or gain his confidence with the best of both hands?

That abominable paper, the New York Evening Post, ascribes all our late reverses to the alleged fact that the nigger "wasn't properly recognized."

Well, perhaps the Journal never had any particular confidence in him. He says that he feels himself aggrieved to think of the implicit faith he has reposed in

WEEKLY JOURNAL.

UNION STATE CONVENTION.

The majority of the General Committee appointed by the Union Convention of the State of Ohio, held at Columbus, in Pickrellville on the 15th March, 1863, consider their duty, and right to call another Convention: Wherefore, it is resolved that the votes of our Convention, and those of the other Union State Conventions, shall endorse the resolution adopted by the Union Convention held in the city of Louisville on the 18th of March last, and who desire to carry out their object, to call another Convention, to be held in the said city on the 25th of May next, for the purpose of forming a State electoral-ticket, and selecting delegates to the Union Convention National Convention which meets in the city of Cincinnati on the 4th of July next.

JAMES GUTHRIE, Chairman.
GEORGE D. PRENTICE,
R. KNIGHT,
GEO. P. DOOREN,
HAMILTON POPE.

THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1864.

SUB—The New York Times is beginning a very extravagant eulogy upon Mr. Lincoln's letter to the Gov. Bramlette, who had previously contemplated organized resistance to the enforcement of colored troops in Kentucky. Was not this a wise and judicious course? And thus the Examiner passed over it, trusted its readers also, to meet in full the spirit of mind the service of the fact on Friday, the 6th last. But as neither bridle nor "spurs of chancery" gave a proper prance, it implored one with this advice:

"Let us face on this day as only Confederates can; let us clothe our souls in the sackcloth and ashes of humility, and let us pray, saying, 'We have sinned against God, and against man, from casting out negroes, and all other slaving sin, from the cradle and gaol of the devil, and Yankees—democrats—' 'lest as only Confederates can' is a graphic expression and shows how catholic we have been to the call of Jeff. It is notable, too, how the Examiner fails to notice the son when his bodily wants are the synonym of hatless, bumble, shirless nakedness. Its prayer, too, is to the old refrain, 'good Lord, poor Devil,' one call above for help, and another below for an abounding of obstinacy and hauteur. One will be answered as the others; the rebels cannot expect to serve God and Mammon; when they repent of their folly and their blind madness, will still come; until then their cries for help will ascend, as are to be quenched as soon as they rise."

BOWLING GREEN FORGORY.—Last week we published a letter from Bowling Green which purposed to give the proceedings of a meeting of the Union citizens of Warren county to select delegates to the Convention to be held in this city on the 25th last, but which turned out to be a mean and contemptible fabrication, as all the names used belong to negroes who are well known in that community. When the deception was discovered, we sent the original manuscript to the Post Office, and the author of the letter was compelled to confess his fraud, and fix the name of the author. We are aware that such things are indulged in sometimes for the sake of saving trouble, but the result must be嗤笑 by every one who is not the highest. The law of our country when in danger, are of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

In the article of Governor Bramlette, General Washington's name was assumed from Cleve's house, but he did not venture to plant his name on the Earl of Darnley, but the result cannot be fairly established that Jefferson ever asserted this doctrine, the result would only be his name, without removing the spot from Mr. Lincoln's; for the doctrine, manifestly subversive of all constitutional government, cannot be embodied by any name, however bright and reverend. The result would be so much more execrable than ever, if he could not be fairly established.

The letter to O'Brien is quoted by the Journal in question as follows:

"The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty of officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity or principle, and the law of humanity, is a difficult and intricate one. We are not prepared to say much for the House of Representatives, and indeed we say very little for it in saying that it is quite equal if not considerably superior to the higher body which has always been regarded as holding it in check."—*Louisville Press*.

The master-spirits of the Senate, the great calm spirits of past years, are gone, and 'tis seem to be none who have the power or even the noble ambition to take their places. Fury and fanaticism seem to be worse in some instances in the Senate than in the House. The latter body appears to be checking the former. The Senate last week, on the bill to organize Montana Territory, adopted a provision according to the telegraph, to grant to negroes the right to vote, but, although a committee of the House made a report recommending that the House concur in the negro suffrage provision, the House itself refused by a majority, and the House of Representatives, and the Committee of Conference to agree to no bill authorizing negro suffrage, but the Senate, reversing the conservative of the House, refused to appoint another Committee of Conference.

We hope that the House, prond or vain that it has exhibited in this instance, will feel encouraged to see what it can do hereafter in the way of rebuking Senatorial and Executive usurpation.

Mr. Jefferson's language, fairly construed, can be drawn no further than to the assertion that citizens, in an extreme and instant emergency, exasperately transgress the law, at the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

But this comes far short of the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, who declares, that whenever the executive deems it indispensable to violate the constitution, the violation becomes *ipso facto* lawful; that, in other words, half of the executive and not the constitution is the supreme law. Mr. Jefferson's view, in its extreme form, leaves the supremacy and majesty of the constitution unquestioned, requiring the transgressor to acknowledge his transgression, to account for it to the law, and to accept indemnity or submit to punishment as the lawful tribunals may adjudge. Mr. Lincoln's view, on the contrary, subjects the constitution to the will of the executive, enjoining the violation of the law, the infallibility of the executive, and holds him unfree to the law, the same time disclaiming his responsibility to the law in the event of his conviction and throwing himself upon the proper tribunal for indemnity. This is the utmost extent to which Mr. Jefferson's language can be fairly stretched. We are no more intelligent and candid man will attempt to stretch it further.

U.S. 10-40 BONDS.

THREE BONDS ARE ISSUED UNDER THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF MARCH 25, 1864, WHICH PROVIDES THAT IN LIEU OF SO MUCH OF THE DEBT AUTHORIZED BY THE ACT OF MARCH 2, 1863, THE UNION WILL MEET IN STATE CONVENTION IN THIS CITY. AT THE SAME TIME AND PLACE, THE NEW PARTY, ORGANIZING TO SUPPORT THE ABOLITION CANDIDATE FOR THE PRESIDENCY AND TO SERVE IN KENTUCKY, THE ENDS OF ABOLITIONISM IN GENERAL, WILL MEET IN LIKE MANNER. THE UNION PARTY WILL MEET IN RESPONSE TO A CALL REGULARLY ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY, AND ADDRESSED TO THE INVESTIGATORS OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE PARTY AS REGULARLY DECLARED BY THE PARTY ITSELF. THE MEETING WILL BE A CONVENTION OF THE UNION PARTY OF KENTUCKY. THE NEW PARTY WILL MEET IN RESPONSE TO A CALL FORMALLY ISSUED BY INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE EITHER ESCAPED FROM THE UNION PARTY OR NEVER BEEN LOYAL TO IT, AND ADDRESSED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNION PARTY WHO HAVE BEEN HARMED BY THE UNION PARTY OR HAVE BEEN HARSHLY TREATED BY THE UNION PARTY.

MARRIED.

At the Washington Methodist Church on Wednesday evening, Rev. Mr. W. H. French, D. S. Chamberlain to Miss Hattie Bourne.

BALTIMORE.—Price advanced to \$1000.

GOALS.—In good request at \$1000.

GOALS.—Market quoted with small \$100 for palm and orange.

GOALS.—\$1000.

GOALS.—\$1000.</p

